

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,322	07/07/2003	Amy E. Battles	10016217-1	7357
22879 HEWI ETT PA	7590 04/11/2007 ACKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 2724	100, 3404 E. HARMONY	HERNANDEZ, NELSON D		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/614,322	BATTLES ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Nelson D. Hernandez	2622			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY					
 Extensi after SI. If NO po Failure Any rep 	IEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Ja	nuary 2007.				
2a)⊠ T	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□ S	S) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
С	losed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Dispositio	n of Claims					
4)⊠ C	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 13-19</u> is/are pending in the application.					
48	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)□ C	claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	laim(s) <u>1-11 and 13-19</u> is/are rejected.	•	•			
	claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)∐ C	claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicatio	n Papers					
9)∐ Ti	ne specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ TI	ne drawing(s) filed on <u>07 July 2003</u> is/are: a)[oxtimes accepted or b) $igsqcup$ objected to b	y the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)[11	ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) <u> </u>	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3	. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	·	ed in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
. Se	e the attached detailed Office action for a list of	or the certified copies not receive	a.			
Attachment(s						
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Informa	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) lo(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P.				

Application/Control Number: 10/614,322

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on January 3, 2007. Claims 1, 9 and 15 have been amended. Claims 12 and 20 have been canceled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 9 and 15** have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection under 35 USC § 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-11 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, In lines 11-12, in the limitations "ceasing to present on the display in response to the signal indicative of said pitch angle in response to input received from user input control". The limitations as written are indefinite in the sense of whether the "ceasing to present on the display" is performed in response to the signal indicative of said pitch angle or if is performed in response to input received from user input control. Also in lines 13-14, in the limitations "indicating a distance between electrostatic plates of the image capture device when an inertial element causes a cantilever to deform". The claim is not clear of how said distance is related the rest of

Application/Control Number: 10/614,322

Art Unit: 2622

the claim (setting an image capture device to one of a plurality of available operational modes). How is the distance related to setting an image capture device to one of a plurality of available operational modes?

Regarding claim 9, In lines 11-12, in the limitations "a user input control, wherein said user interface logic ceases to control said display in response to said signal indicative of said pitch angle in response to input received from said user input control, wherein said signal is indicative of a distance between electrostatic plates when an inertial element causes a cantilever to deform". The limitations as written are indefinite in the sense of whether the "user interface logic ceases to control said display" in response to the signal indicative of said pitch angle or if is in response to input received from user input control. Also, the claim does not point out how the distance between the electrostatic plates when an inertial element causes a cantilever to deform is related to the pitch angle of the camera.

Regarding claim 15, In lines 9-10, in the limitations "means for ceasing to control the display in response to the signal indicative of said pitch angle in response to input received from user input control". The limitations as written are indefinite in the sense of whether the "means for ceasing to control the display" is in response to the signal indicative of said pitch angle or if is in response to input received from user input control. Also in lines 11-12, in the limitations "means for indicating a distance between electrostatic plates of the image capture, device when an inertial element causes a cantilever to deform". The claim is not clear of how said distance is related the rest of the claim (controlling the operation of the means for displaying an image). How is the distance related to controlling the operation of the means for displaying an image?

Application/Control Number: 10/614,322

Art Unit: 2622

Claims 2-8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being dependent from rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-11 and 13-19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez Examiner

Page 5

Art Unit 2622

NDHH March 31, 2007

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER